
Minutes

Call to Order

- 1) Roll Call—Tom Vujovich, Rich Stenner, Jim Lienhoop, Matt Souza, Steve Champion
Absent—George Van Horn
Staff—Ed Curtin
Guests—Mayor Fred Armstrong, Sharon Renfro, Paul Minnis, Kristi Belcher

Action Items

- 2) Oath—The bonding company required that each commission member sign it. Steve Champion did not have one and we are tracking it down. It is to make sure that the members have read the document.
- 3) Approve minutes
 - a. 1-20-09—Motion made by Matt Souza and seconded by Jim Lienhoop. Approved.
 - b. 2-2-09—Motion made by Rich Stenner and seconded by Jim Lienhoop. Approved.
- 4) Selection of Owners Rep for Commons Project—Based upon the information that was provided to us through the interview and the other information provided we recommend to the sub-committee to select Taylor Brothers as the owners rep for the Commons project. Tom Vujovich, Ed Curtin, and Rich Stenner all participated in the interviewing process of the candidates. The determining features that had Taylor Brothers prevailing over the others were the fair amount of experience, locally and nationally, with projects similar to this and the team gave us a level of comfort that we have more than one person looking at the project throughout the course of the project and that with the combination with what there fee was going to be. There fee was not the lowest. It was \$74,360.00. The fee from CPS was \$70,000 and the fee from ROI was based on 1% of the total construction cost. If the construction cost come in at \$14 Million than it would be estimated at \$140,000 for ROI. We do expect the construction cost to be \$14 Million. Each firm had features in their favor yet when it came down to experience and depth, Taylor Brothers rose to the top. The work that Taylor Brothers did for the Columbus Learning Center in doing essentially the same type of role as we are asking here and getting positive feedback from those who have been involved with that project helped in making the decision. Taylor Brother has the same principles then as they do today. They are also a locally based company with great expertise in the business. To have someone available as the owners rep throughout the construction and the possibility of having that same business available in the years to come as maintenance issues come up is a pretty important thing to consider. The other way we selected the three companies was the feeling that there were a number of local companies who could perform this task without having to go outside of the community and hire somebody else. One issue that may come up is that

David Doup works for Taylor Brothers and is also the person in charge of the Commons board and now we have Taylor Brothers bidding for this project. To solve this issue we were told that if Taylor Brothers was selected for the project that David Doup would resign from the Commons board effective immediately. We were also told that they have no interest in bidding on the project so there would not be any conflict of interest. David Doup has removed himself from any decisions/vote on the construction of the Commons project. Motion to except the recommendation of the committee and to move forward with contracting with Taylor Brothers as our Owners Rep for the Commons project was made by Rich Stenner and seconded by Jim Lienhoop. Motion was carried.

- 5) Inter-local government agreement—This is an agreement between the Redevelopment Commission and the Board of Aviation. The intent is that they would transfer approximately 11.4 acres to the Redevelopment Commission so that it is in the position where we can take advantage for some redevelopment purposes. It also lays out the description of that property and what the terms are. The appraised value is \$367,500.00 which is about average for the appraisals that we had. This would ultimately be paid back to the Board of Aviation within the next 3 years. There are two parts: one the agreement and two the promissory note. We had two appraisals done. One appraisal was done locally and the other was not. The range of values between the appraisals was narrow, within \$10,000-\$20,000 total which is less than 10%. We are using this property for bartering purposes somewhere down the road. The promissory note is our security on payment against the property 2-3 years from now. The Board of Aviation is comfortable to our knowledge of the average appraised value of the property. The Board of Aviation's meeting is next week. One way or another we would know next week. This is important because it gives us the ability to have some impact on redevelopment in areas where we want to see in the downtown area. On the promissory note in the 2nd paragraph, end of last line, the word protect needs to be changed to protest. Motion is to for the recommendation that we enter into the Inter-local government agreement with the Board of Aviation and to execute the promissory note was made by Rich Stenner and seconded by Matt Souza. Motion was approved.
- 6) Claims—Payment for Hagerman is on schedule. Patriot has been doing soil testing and testing the concrete. Every pour is tested for the strength of the design. The payments are as they are doing the work. Johnson-Witkemper is for the bonds. Motion to approve the claims as submitted was made by Matt Souza and seconded by Jim Lienhoop. Claims are approved.

Discussion Items

- 7) Website Presentation—Took a look at the Redevelopment Commission website. It includes information of the Redevelopment Commission such as minutes, agenda, projects, etc. The website address is <http://www.columbus.in.gov/redevelopment/redevelopment-index.php>. The projects will have powerpoints of the general information about each project. It

will be done with the next week or two. The minutes are the ones that are approved but it will be listed as “draft” until they are approved by the commission. After the commission does approve the minutes they will be labeled “final”. We are working on allowing Kristi to be able to make her our updates to the website.

- 8) Riverfront District—we will be going to City Council tomorrow night at 6pm. There will be three pieces that will go to City Council rep. One is the resolution, the next is the local rules, and the last is the map. The rules have some changes from Tim that have been incorporated. The two biggest pieces that are in addition for the rules are to have \$150,000 in total gross food sales annually and we are looking into limiting the number of permits to 10 for the district. For each application the commission would review it and make a recommendation to the Mayor who would then review it and write a letter in favor of or against each application. One of the requirements by the State is that the Riverfront District has to have an underline economic or some type of economic development district as its base. Our base for the outline of the district is our economic development area which coincides with our TIF area that we have for the central area of our downtown. The State does not allow for the commission to add fees on top the State fees.

Information Items

- 9) Staff Report—We will be going to City Council for another reading on the ordinance for the Commons and also for another reading on the rezoning for the Rhino Lining property. We have continued to work with the Indoor Sports Complex folks and are moving forward with that. They still want to start construction at the end of March beginning of April. We continue to have conversations with the housing developer around the 2nd St. Garage. We did have the signatures filled for the Commons project. They are in the process of being reviewed. We have started monitoring the garage last Monday. We put out 18 warnings on cars. On Friday we had 3. It seems to be working. Think that it helped solve the problems. Received lots of good comments. We have about 9 spaces left for lease for the \$65 spaces. We have 8 spaces on the roof for lease. The tenant build-out is going well. The Garage Pub looks like it will be open March 18th and Bistro 310 is looking like it will be open March 28th. There have been a few issues. Because of the design of the garage we have had to go all electric. This made us have to put a new transformer in the alley. We also had to pull lines so that each restaurant had 600 amp panels. The other issue is the venting of the hood for Tom’s restaurant. Jeff’s hood will vent out into the alley. Tom’s hood vents out into the parking garage. We are looking into whether we let it vent into the parking garage or do we pull it out. If we did this it would go out onto Jackson St. Sharon has looked at a lot of vents in different community restaurants such as Indianapolis and Bloomington. Indianapolis had one that vented into a parking garage that wasn’t a pretty site but it is in a place where you really couldn’t see. Bloomington had restaurants that vented out onto the streets but it wasn’t bad. It may depend on what type of vent used.

They have to have 3 filters to help keep it clean. Since the garage is so open the odors coming from the garage wouldn't seem so bad. If we allow Tom to vent into the garage and it becomes a problem he said he would pay to have the vent go out to the sidewalk. The 2nd garage will be different in that the retail will be built-out as a separate building around the garage.

Board Comments

Adjourn